



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10 039,783	11 09 2001	Steven E. Morton	ECSIX 104	9088

2555 7590 03/24/2003

KREMBLAS, FOSTER, PHILLIPS & POLLOCK
7632 SLATE RIDGE BOULEVARD
REYNOLDSBURG, OH 43068

EXAMINER

WATKINS III, WILLIAM P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1772

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/039,783

Applicant(s)

MORTON, STEVEN E.

Examiner

William P. Watkins III

Art Unit

1772

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 November 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 1772

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 29-34 and 36, drawn to a coating of a matrix with fiber and an adhered particle layer, said matrix being adjacent to the substrate, classified in class 428, subclass 143.
- II. Claims 1-28 and 35, drawn to a method of making a coating by embedding fiber in a liquid matrix and particles on top of the matrix, then hardening the matrix, classified in class 427, subclass 180.
- III. Claim 42, drawn to a method of making a coating by applying adhesive on a hardened matrix to bind particles to the matrix and to bind the matrix to a substrate, classified in class 156, subclass 279.
- IV. Claim 38, drawn to a hardened matrix on a substrate with a rigid flooring on the matrix, classified in class 428, subclass 292.1.
- V. Claim 37, drawn to a method of making a matrix on a substrate with a mounted layer of rigid flooring, classified in class 156, subclass 242.
- VI. Claim 39-40, drawn to a modular flooring unit not formed on a substrate, classified in class 428, subclass 44.

Art Unit: 1772

VII. Claim 41, drawn to a method of making a modular floor unit, classified in class 264, subclass 299.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions 1) Groups I, II, and III; 2) Groups IV and V; and 3) Groups VI and VII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different modes of operation or functions.

Groups I, II and III involve a coating formed of a matrix on a substrate with an exposed particle layer that functions as the outer surface of the matrix. Groups IV and V function with an outer surface of a rigid flooring material. Groups VI and VII function as modular units.

3. Inventions Groups II and III; and Group I are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially

Art Unit: 1772

different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)).

In the instant case the product can either be made by the distinct methods of Group II or Group III.

4. Inventions Group II and Group III are unrelated.

Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions operate by different means. In Group II, the particles are joined to the matrix while it is in fluid form. In Group III, the particles are joined to a hardened matrix by an adhesive layer.

5. Inventions Group V and IV are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product could be made by a different method such as hardening the matrix before joining to the substrate.

6. Inventions Group VII and VI are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product could be made by a different method such as the particles could be adhered to the matrix after it is hardened by adhesive.

7. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, and since the fields of search are not co-extensive, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

8. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: 1) a concrete substrate (claims 3 and 18), 2) an asphalt pavement substrate (claims 4 and 19), 3) a wood substrate (claims 5 and 20), 4) a fiberglass composite substrate (claims 6 and 21), 5) a metal substrate (claims 7 and 22), 6) a modular brick substrate

Art Unit: 1772

(claims 8 and 23), 7) a soil substrate (claims 10 and 25), 8) a sand substrate (claims 11 and 26), 9) a gravel substrate (12 and 27).

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1, 14, 15, 16, 29, 32, 35, 36, 37, 38 and 42 are generic to all of the species. Claims 2, 14, 30 and 33 are generic to species 1-6. Claims 9, 13, 24, 28, 31 and 34 are generic to species 7-9.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant

Art Unit: 1772

must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

9. A telephone call was not made due to the complex nature of the restriction requirement. Applicant is required to elect a group to be examined as well as a species to be examined within the elected group.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William P. Watkins III whose telephone number is 703-308-2420. The examiner works an increased flex time schedule, but can normally be reached Monday through Friday, 11:30 A.M. through 8:00 P.M.

Art Unit: 1772

Eastern Time. The examiner returns all calls within one business day unless an extended absence is noted on his voice mail greeting.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon can be reached on 703-308-4251. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0651.

William P. Watkins III

WW/ww
March 19, 2003

WILLIAM P. WATKINS III
PRIMARY EXAMINER